

which support it in a greater or less degree. If the Western text (and not the NB group) really represents St. Luke's autograph, it goes back to a single original, and this original may with some measure of certainty be restored: but this can only be done by carefully comparing and sifting all the various documents. So long as each fresh writer is content to put out a text based mainly (if not entirely) on his own views as to what St. Luke was likely to have written, we shall make but little progress; and of this unfortunately Dr. Hilgenfeld's treatise affords fresh illustration.

A. V. VALENTINE-RICHARDS.

DR. SWETE'S ST. MARK.

The Gospel according to St. Mark, the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices, by HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, D.D., Hon. Litt.D., Dublin, Regius Professor of Divinity and Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. (Macmillan, 1898, pp. cx + 412.)

It was a great satisfaction to many to learn that Dr. Swete had added to the great services which he has rendered to the study of Theology by producing a Commentary on the second Gospel. Although the work of Dr. Gould on St. Mark had preceded him by only a few years, it was felt by not a few of those who used the help given to them by the American scholar that there was still room for a commentary on St. Mark to supply to English-speaking students the kind of aid which was required by those who wished to keep themselves informed respecting the best results of sober criticism, without falling victims to the conjectures of a criticism which is bold rather than sober. And this is just what we find in the volume before us. As regards the text to be adopted, and also the exegesis of it, the work is both critical and constructive. There is no timid adherence to uncritical conservatism; and there are no hasty surrenders to insecure criticism. It is possible that a few will find the sobriety cold; but both the true student and the devout Christian will certainly find the book helpful. In solid learning, as well as in well-balanced judgement, it is a worthy companion of the volumes which it also resembles in external form, the Commentaries of Lightfoot on St. Paul, and of Westcott on St. John and on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In his preface Dr. Swete points out that 'the briefest of the Gospels is in some respects the fullest and the most exacting; the simplest of the books of the New Testament brings us nearest to the feet of the

Master. The interpreter of St. Mark fulfils his office so far as he assists the student to understand, and in turn to interpret to others, this primitive picture of the Incarnate Life.' Those who have made frequent use of this volume during the twenty months that have elapsed since its appearance will probably agree that the standard of fulfilment which has been reached is in this case a high one. It is worthy of Dr. Swete's reputation and of the Chair which he fills. Apparently it is to be followed (we hope at no very distant date) by a volume of notes and dissertations on 'some of the points raised by this Gospel which seemed to require fuller investigation'; and there we may expect to find what seems to be missing here. But a larger book would have been less handy; and it would not be easy to point to much that could be spared, in order to make room for an equal amount of what is absent.

The Introduction is divided into twelve sections, of which the first and longest is on the 'Personal History of St. Mark.' That he was the young man mentioned in xiv 51, 52 is thought not unlikely. The incident is evidently no part of the common tradition, but is the outcome of the writer's own recollection or special knowledge. That the John Mark of the Acts is identical with the Mark of the Pauline Epistles is regarded as 'placed beyond reasonable doubt by Col. iv 10,' where St. Paul gives the relationship between Mark and Barnabas, and yet hints that the Colossians might be shy of the man who had formerly left Barnabas and Paul at Perga and returned to Jerusalem (Acts xiii 13). The various traditions which assign the foundation of the Church of Alexandria to St. Mark are thought worthy of credit. The statement of Eusebius that Mark's successor at Alexandria was appointed in the eighth year of Nero (A.D. 61-2) explains part of the long interval between Mark's departure from St. Paul at Perga and his being his *συνεργός* at Rome (Col. iv 11, Philem. 24). The *ὁ υἱός μου* of 1 Pet. v 13 is not interpreted of any spiritual relationship, which St. Paul at any rate commonly expresses by *τέκνον* (1 Cor. iv 17; Phil. ii 22; Philem. 10; 1 Tim. i 2, 18; 2 Tim. i 2, ii 1; Tit. i 4), but as 'the affectionate designation of a former pupil, . . . who had come to look upon his mother's old friend and teacher as a second father.' That 'Babylon' means Rome is firmly retained in spite of the recent efforts of Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 27). If the statement of Dionysius of Corinth that Peter and Paul *ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον* does not compel us to believe—as it certainly does not—that the two Apostles suffered death together, then we ought probably to place the martyrdom of St. Peter after that of St. Paul; and during this interval, say till A.D. 70, we may place Mark's ministering to St. Peter at Rome. That one part of this ministry was acting as the Apostle's 'interpreter,' need not be doubted.

If Peter could speak Greek at all, he 'could scarcely have possessed sufficient knowledge of the language to address a Roman congregation with success.' The suggestion of Papias and statement of Irenaeus, that Mark wrote after Peter's death, is to be preferred to that of Clement, that Peter approved of Mark's writing. Papias had contemporary evidence, Clement had only tradition, which Origen and Jerome somewhat exaggerate until Peter is made to *dictate* to Mark. John the Presbyter, on whom Papias relies, describes what was written in a way that fits our second Gospel very well: it was Mark's record of what he remembered or collected of Peter's recollections respecting the words and acts of Christ. Tregelles' explanation of *ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος* (which Hippolytus gives as a designation of Mark), that it means 'maligner' in the sense of 'deserter,' and refers to his leaving the Apostles at Perga, is not approved by Dr. Swete, who points out that an offensive nickname would not have been accepted at Rome, where Mark was known as a loyal fellow-worker with St. Paul. More probably the epithet points to 'a personal peculiarity which had impressed itself on the memory of the Roman Church.'

In § III some year between the death of St. Peter and the destruction of Jerusalem is adopted as the date of the second Gospel. A desire for a written record of the Apostle's teaching would quickly arise; and the absence of indication of the fall of Jerusalem, combined with 'the freshness of its colouring and simplicity of its teaching,' point to a date earlier than A. D. 70. The contention of Blass (*Philol. of the Gospels*, p. 196), that St. Mark wrote in Aramaic, and that Papias mistook a Greek translation for the original, is dismissed as not worthy of very much consideration. The Greek is Mark's own; and the hypothesis of an earlier Gospel written by him in Aramaic is not required. Mark's Greek (of which a very valuable analysis is given in § IV) is estimated as that of 'a foreigner who spoke Greek with some freedom, but had not been accustomed to employ it for literary purposes.' The Latinisms in it have perhaps been insisted upon too much. The Greek which was current in the Roman Empire freely adopted such things. And they would be likely to be frequent in the language of a professional 'interpreter' who had spent some years in Rome.

As to the sources of the Gospel (§ V), Dr. Swete believes that Mark has added to the teaching of St. Peter a few particulars, such as the martyrdom of the Baptist, the flight of the young man in the garden, one or two explanatory notes (*e.g.* vii 3, 4 and 19 *b*), and the interpretations of Aramaic expressions. All these may be assigned to the Evangelist himself. In chapters xiii, xiv he seems to have made use of previously existing documents. Whether or no the Gospel as he left it has received much revision from another hand is a question reserved

for future discussion; but probably the first verse, and certainly the last twelve verses, are no part of the original work. The alternative endings are discussed in § XI, and the conclusion reached is, 'that they [the twelve verses] belong to another work, whether that of Aristion or of some unknown writer of the first century.' 'Unless we entirely misjudge the writer of the second Gospel, the last twelve verses are the work of another mind, trained in another school.'

In the list of commentaries on St. Mark, eleven among those which have appeared in the present century are mentioned, seven of which are English. They are placed in chronological order, and no attempt is made to estimate either their characteristics or their value. It would be a help to students who are beginning a library, and who cannot afford to have many books, if at least an asterisk were put to those commentaries which are considered to be specially useful. Some rather well known commentaries are not mentioned.

A few instances of Dr. Swete's refusal to make concessions to the claims of speculative criticism may be mentioned. He exhibits this refusal in two ways, sometimes by merely ignoring the other view, and sometimes by arguing against it. In the notes on i 10, 11 there is no hint that either the descent of the Spirit like a dove, or the Voice from heaven, are to be regarded as legendary additions to the history of the Baptism. There was an actual vision, primarily for the Christ, in which the Baptist was allowed to share as a witness; 'the Voice was audible or articulate only to those who had "ears to hear"'; and 'the immanence of the Spirit in Jesus was at once the purpose of the Descent and the evidence of His being the Christ.' In discussing the Temptation no attention is paid to the suggestion that St. Mark's account of the matter is the only historical one, and that temptations which really took place much later, and during the ministry, have been 'conflated' by Matthew and Luke with the original narrative. Still less is doubt thrown upon the reality of either Satan or the ministering angels. The imperfect (*δηκόνουν*) is interpreted of the whole forty days. The notes on i 23-26 assume the reality of demoniacal possession. The phrase to be *ἐν πνεύματι* most often refers to the Holy Spirit, 'but there is nothing in the formula to forbid its application to evil spirits in their relation to men under their control.' 'An exodus was possible, since the human personality, although overpowered, remained intact, awaiting the Deliverer.' So again on v. 34; 'It does not seem as though their knowledge [the demons'] went beyond the fact of His Messiahship.' In the case of the Gerasene demoniac there is no toning down of the narrative; 'The unclean spirits recognize that *βασανισμός* awaits them' (v 7). 'The sing. is used because the spirits, speaking by the voice of the man, are still regarded as a single *ego*' (v. 10). 'The spirits at

length dissociate themselves from the man, for they know that their hold over him is at an end, and the plural is consequently used' (v. 12). The restoration of Jairus' daughter is regarded as a case of raising the dead, and Christ's words, 'is not dead, but sleepeth,' are interpreted as meaning, 'a death from which there is to be so speedy an awakening can only be regarded as a sleep' (v 39). In the O. T., when a prophet raises the dead, he is alone, but 'our Lord, *knowing the issue* (Jo. xi 41, 42), chooses to work in the presence of witnesses,' but takes only three of the Apostles, so as 'not to invade at such a time the seclusion of the home life.' And the Transfiguration is accepted in the sense in which the Evangelists give it to us. The $\alpha\phi\theta\eta$ of ix 4 'does not imply either an illusion or a dream; the three, according to Luke, had been disposed to slumber, but were thoroughly roused by the occurrence and saw everything. How the vision was impressed upon the eyes it is useless to enquire.' It is pointed out that 'knew not what to answer' occurs both in the account of the Transfiguration (ix 6) and in that of the Agony (xiv 40); but it is not suggested that either this or the drowsiness has been transferred from the one occasion to the other. Of the Voice from heaven it is remarked that 'it was the first Voice from heaven which the Apostles had heard.' On the other hand there is no attempt to give to the Transfiguration special significances, which, whether they be true or not, are not marked for us in the Gospels and are beyond our knowledge. Although it is believed that in ch. xiii St. Mark is making use of a document rather than of the teaching of St. Peter, there is no countenance given to the view that we have here a leaf from a Jewish Apocalypse, which has been adapted to the Gospel narrative. 'The very posture in which the Lord delivered His great prophecy was remembered and found a place in the earliest tradition' (xiii 3). And the remarkable parenthesis, 'He that readeth, let him understand,' is thought to take the document on which Mark here depends 'back to days before the first investment of Jerusalem (A. D. 66) when the sign yet needed interpretation' (v. 14). In the account of the anointing of Christ's feet the act of Mary at Bethany is expressly distinguished from that of the sinner in the house of Simon the Pharisee. 'Tatian *rightly* limits himself here to Mt. Mc. Jo., placing Lc. vii 36 ff. in another and much earlier connexion;' and 'it is not necessary to regard the reference to Simon in Mt. and Mc. as due to the influence of Lc.'s story' (xiv 3). Similarly, the cleansing of the Temple narrated by the Synoptists is assumed to be distinct from that narrated by St. John. 'The market was within the Precinct, and had already attracted the attention of Jesus at the first Passover of His ministry' (xi 15).

That these results, to which others of the same kind might be added,

are the outcome of careful and thorough criticism, and not of timid conservatism or harmonistic prejudice, is shown by instances in which the same sober criticism leads Dr. Swete to the admission that the evangelistic record may have lost historic accuracy before it was written in its present form, that one Gospel is sometimes more accurate than another, and that a statement in one may be inconsistent with a statement in another. And in all such questions as to the trustworthiness of the narrative, the appeal is to reasonable critical methods, not to our own ideas as to what inspiration is likely to effect. One or two instances will illustrate this. In ii 26 the words 'in the time of Abiathar the high priest' conflict with i Sam. xxi 1-6, and 'may be an editorial note' which Mark has inserted into Christ's words. 'Mc. suggests, and Mt. seems distinctly to state, that this visit to the synagogue followed immediately after the cornfield incident; Lc. places it on another Sabbath . . . the two traditions if not absolutely inconsistent are clearly distinct' (iii 1). 'Mt. with less probability makes the rebuke precede the stilling of the storm' (iv 40). 'The mention of one demoniac does not exclude the presence of a second, unless it is expressly stated that he was alone: still it indicates either a distinct or a blurred tradition. Mc.'s description is too minute in other respects to permit us to suppose that it is defective here' (v 2). 'Mt. and Lc. exclude even this [the staff as well as purse and scrip]—an early exaggeration of the sternness of the command. . . . There seems to be no warrant for distinguishing *σανδάλιον* and *ὑπόδημα*. . . . If so, Mc.'s account is again at issue with Mt. and Lc.' (vi 8, 9). Here the concluding 'and Lc.' should be omitted. In the charge to the *Seventy* Luke places a prohibition of *ὑποδήματα* (x 4): in the charge to the Twelve (ix 3) sandals are not mentioned. 'The tradition in Mt. is strangely different . . . Mc.'s account has the ring of real life' (vi 20). 'Mt. alters the setting of this incident by placing it on or after the arrival; in Mc. the omission is discovered, as it appears, while they are crossing' (viii 14). To Christ's prediction of His second advent 'Mt., interpreting the Lord's words by the conviction which possessed the first generation, prefixes *εὐθείως*' (xiii 24). See also notes on xi 20, xiv 20, 29. On one of Augustine's attempts at harmonizing Dr. Swete remarks, 'The uncertainty thus imported into the history is surely a worse evil than any doubt that can arise as to the precise accuracy of one of the reports' (ii 18),—a principle which should be laid to heart by those who are willing to accept almost any improbable solution rather than admit a real discrepancy.

There are one or two notes of special interest as indicating Dr. Swete's view respecting the *κένωσις*. On i 22, ii 10 and iii 14 it is clearly pointed out that Christ's *ἐξουσία* is delegated to Him from the Father and from Him to the Apostles. The woman with the issue was healed

without Christ's knowing *who* had been healed. To those who criticized His question His 'only reply was to look round with a scrutinizing gaze which revealed to Him the individual who had stolen a cure' (v 32). When Christ saw the fig-tree afar off, its condition 'seemed to offer the necessary refreshment. . . . But when the Lord had come up to it, He found that the tree did not fulfil its promise' (xi 12, 13; cf. the note on xiv 37). 'Ps. cx is assigned to David in the title (M. T., LXX.), and the attribution was probably undisputed in the first century, and accepted by our Lord and His Apostles (Acts ii 34) on the authority of the recognised guardians of the canon. . . . His whole argument rests on the hypothesis that the prevalent view was correct' (xii 36). On *ἡρξάτο ἐκθαμβείσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν* we have, 'The Lord was overwhelmed with sorrow (see next verse), but His first feeling was one of terrified surprise. Long as He had foreseen the Passion, when it came clearly into view its terrors exceeded His anticipations. His human soul received a new experience—*ἤμαθεν ἀφ' οὗ ἔπαθεν*, and the last lesson of obedience began with a sensation of inconceivable awe. With this there came another, that of overpowering mental distress. . . . The Lord's human soul shrank from the Cross, and the fact adds to our sense of the greatness of His sacrifice' (xiv 33, 34).

The Greek text adopted by Dr. Swete is nearly the same as that of WH. In one much discussed place he dissents from it. In vi 22 he unhesitatingly rejects *αὐτοῦ* for *αὐτῆς* in *τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος*. A reading 'which represents the girl as bearing her mother's name and as the daughter of Antipas, can scarcely be anything but an error, even if a primitive one: her name was Salome and she was the grand-niece, not the daughter, of Antipas.' In other cases in which WH. and RV. differ, Dr. Swete agrees with WH.; e. g. i 1, x 24, xiii 33.

There are a few things which might be corrected in the next edition; p. xliii, l. 15, viii 35 should be vii 35; p. cii, l. 28, 'suspicion of their genuineness' should be 'doubt as to their genuineness'; note on iii 28, l. 3, Lc. ⁸ should be Lc. ⁶; note on viii 37, last line, iv 28 should be iv. 29. On vi 19 it might be worth while to cite the provincialism 'to have it in with' (or 'for') 'a man,' i. e. 'to be on bad terms or have a quarrel with him,' as illustrating *ἐμίχεν αὐτῷ*.

This notice has reached its full limits, but it gives only a poor idea of the wealth of learning and thoughtful comment to be found in Dr. Swete's volume. Most readers of the JOURNAL probably possess it already. It is hoped that what has been said here will induce some of the minority to become acquainted with it and form a more adequate idea of it for themselves.

A. PLUMMER.